	1)
1	
2	MR. LANGLEY: That's correct.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: that the witness has
4	now? And what is up on the screen as 52 received
5	in evidence as 52 is the corrected version?
6	MR. LANGLEY: That is correct, Your Honor.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, then I
8	would like to just stay with the corrected version.
9	MR. COOK: Very good, Your Honor. In fact
10	my question
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: And and go ahead. I
12	think that's I want wait a minute. I just want
13	to put this to rest. All right.
14	MR. COOK: Yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: So as far as as the
16	pages that are before the witness right now, we don't
17	really have to refer to them any more.
18	MR. COOK: In fact, I have no further
19	questions. My question was more a question that
20	focused on notice of when this witness was receiving
21	information, not on any specific numbers.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Okay.

JUDGE SIPPEL:

1	MR. COOK: So I'm done with that.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
3	MR. COOK: Okay.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
5	MR. COOK: Let's see. I'm moving on.
6	BY MR. COOK:
7	Q Now if I understand correctly, even though
8	you say pole capacity is not your area, you take issue
9	with Alabama Power's requirement that full capacity be
10	demonstrated before any rate can be charged above
11	marginal costs testifying in your testimony that such
12	a requirement quote is contrary to end quote you
13	understanding of business valuation principles, right?
14	A That's correct.
15	Q Okay. Now let's turn to the second prong
16	of Alabama Power. You have also or you agree,
17	right, that Gulf Power has not asked you to study the
18	question of whether it has incurred a lost
19	opportunity, right?
20	A That was not explicitly stated. However,
21	there is an element of that within the the work
22	that I did.

1	Q Okay. Could I direct your attention to
2	page 255 of the Deposition Excerpts. And within that,
3	to page 209 of your deposition
4	A Okay.
5	Q where line eight, (reading) "Question.
6	Have you been asked by Gulf Power to study the issue
7	of lost opportunity. Answer. No. As to it's poles?
8	Answer. No" (end reading). Did I read that
9	correctly?
LO	A Yes.
L1	Q Okay.
L2	A And I hope that what I just said is, and
L3	I certainly meant the same thing, that's that was
L 4	not an explicit request. However, there
L5	there is probably an element of that within what I was
L6	asked to do, which is to determine the appropriate
L7	fair market value for for elevated communication
L8	corridor or pole space in this case.
L9	Q But you acknowledged at your deposition
20	when I asked you straightforwardly have you been asked
21	to study the issue of lost opportunity, you gave a one
22	word answer, no, right?

1	A And again, I took that question to mean -
2	-
3	Q Is that correct?
4	MR. ESTES: Objection. Asked and
5	answered. He's already asked this question three
6	times. He's answered it twice.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Wait. I I
8	wait. I want to sustain that objection. You got him
9	exactly where you wanted him on respect to the
10	deposition. Now, your next question is what?
11	MR. COOK: I'll move on. What I would ask
12	is when I do ask a yes or no question that the answer
13	start with a yes or no and then the witness may
14	proceed to explain. I'll move on.
15	MR. ESTES: Your Honor, the witness has a
16	right to give a full and complete answer whether Mr.
17	Cook wants to demand a yes or no question, he can
18	demand it. But the witness has a right to give full
19	and complete, and if I have to do it all on redirect,
20	and we can be here until six o'clock tonight.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
22	MR. ESTES: Or we can let the witness

1	fully answer the question.
2	MR. COOK: Well, actually, Your Honor,
3	that's not accurate. A witness, on cross, the cross
4	questioner is entitled to a yes or no answer when the
5	question asks for a yes or no. And you're right, the
6	proper place is on redirect.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I well, I agree
8	with both of you, but the point is is that I'm trying
9	to get this thing moved along. You should be you
10	should have answered him yes or no on that,
11	particularly when he had you pinned down on your
12	deposition answers. That's all he was asking.
13	However, the significance of him not saying yes or no
14	is really de minimus because it's established. All
15	right. Now
16	MR. COOK: Let's
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: but what are you going
18	to do with this information?
19	MR. COOK: Move forward to ask more
20	questions.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Didn't he did you say
22	something now you said something, Mr. Spain, about

1	no, you didn't you didn't actually do you didn't
2	actually you didn't specifically do a a lost
3	opportunity analysis but that it somehow or other was
4	implied in how you addressed the problem? Did I hear
5	you right?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, that that
7	the issue of lost opportunity is is related
8	somewhat to determine the appropriate method for
9	determining fair market value of pole space.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now do you want
11	to ask him any questions on that answer?
12	MR. COOK: I guess my question would be if
13	if that's the case, then at your deposition when I
14	said have you been asked to study the issue of lost
15	opportunity, why did you say simply no?
16	THE WITNESS: I took that question to mean
17	have I been specifically explicitly asked to study
18	that, and specifically and explicitly, I was not asked
19	to study that.
20	MR. COOK: Okay. Very good. That was my
21	question.
22	BY MR. COOK:

1	Q Now you have not looked at whether
2	attachments by any of the four cable companies in this
3	case have prevented Gulf Power from leasing pole space
4	to a third party, right?
5	A I've not assessed that.
6	Q Okay. And Gulf has not shown you any
7	evidence that it had incurred an actual loss that
8	might be a basis for departing from the FCC pole rate
9	formula, right?
LO	A I I've not seen a calculation of actual
L1	loss based on that, no.
L2	Q Okay. The scope of work that you did did
L3	not involve trying to determine whether cable
L4	attachments have actually caused Gulf Power to lose
L5	money, right?
L6	A No. Can you rephrase that. I want to
L7	make
L8	Q Sure.
ا 9	A sure I understand your question. I'm
20	sorry.
21	Q Your scope of work when you got your
22	scope of work from Gulf Power, that did not involve

1	trying to determine whether cable attachments had
2	actually caused Gulf Power to lose money, right?
3	A No.
4	Q Okay. Meaning no it did not?
5	A No, it did not.
6	Q Okay. For the record, okay. There's some
7	of those questions where you say no and you look at it
8	later. Okay. And you have not seen any evidence that
9	Gulf Power has any unreimbursed costs caused by the
LO	cable operators' attachments, right?
L1	A I've not seen records of such.
L2	Q Okay. But you do offer an opinion in this
L3	proceeding, I believe it's testimony page 26, that the
L4	Eleventh Circuit Alabama Power language about another
L5	buyer waiting in the wings must be a reference to a
L6	hypothetical buyer, right.
L7	A Based on my reading and interpretation of
L8	that as a CPA and a CVA, yes, that looks to me like a
L9	reference to the hypothetical buyer in a fair market
20	value situation.
21	Q Okay. And y our reason for saying that
22	the court must mean a hypothetical buyer is not

1	something in the court's opinion itself but rather
2	your underlying instruction to use fair market value
3	as your standard, right?
4	MR. ESTES: Objection, Your Honor. It
5	completely mischaracterizes the answer he just gave,
6	which was well, I'll let the record show what is
7	his answer that he just gave. That's a complete
8	mischaracterization of what he just said.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have to you
10	really should be asking questions and not
11	characterizing what he said. Then we don't have to
12	get into this.
13	MR. COOK: Okay. I'd like to direct the
14	witness' attention to page 255
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of his deposition
16	MR. COOK: of his of the Deposition
17	Excerpts, and within that, two pages, 210 to 211
18	actually, page yeah, okay 210 to 211 of the
19	Deposition on Complainants Deposition Excerpts,
20	page 255.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: It looks like the same cast
22	as we have here.
ł	1

1	MR. COOK: Where it says page line 12
2	(reading) "Because the definition" (end reading)
3	sorry (reading) "Question. And why do you say
4	that" (end reading). Let me back up to line six.
5	(Reading) "Okay, you say that any interpretation of
6	this phrase, requiring an actual buyer or actual
7	buyers would be inconsistent with the principles of
8	fair market value standard. Is that right. That's
9	correct" (end reading). Did I read that question and
10	answer correctly.
11	THE WITNESS: Correct.
12	MR. COOK: Okay.
13	BY MR. COOK:
14	Q And then jumping over to 211, line one,
15	(reading) "So are you interpreting the APCo test as to
16	that language to require only a hypothetical buyer.
17	Answer. What I'm saying is that as a valuation
18	analyst using fair market value as a standard of
19	value, the assessment is made as to the value between
20	for exchange of property between a hypothetical buyer
21	and a hypothetical seller" (end reading). Did I read
22	that correctly?

1	A That's correct.
2	Q Okay. Now, do you recall from your review
3	of the Alabama Power case that the Eleventh Circuit
4	said that a party seeking to recover for a taking has
5	the burden of proving loss as well as the amount of
6	any loss?
7	A I I I think I recall that.
8	Q Okay. And if the Alabama Power Eleventh
9	Circuit test requires proof of an actual buyer of pole
10	space that couldn't be accommodated and therefore that
11	Gulf was going to be actually out some money, that's
12	a problem for you, because the fundamental touchstone
13	of your work was fair market value, right?
14	A That that could be information that
15	would be directly related to what I was aske to do.
16	Q Okay. Let me draw your attention to page
17	256, and there, page 213
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's 256 of the excerpts?
19	MR. COOK: Two fifty-six of the excerpts.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: And then you're going to
21	page 213 of the deposition.
22	MR. COOK: Two thirteen.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you following that --1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And on page 213 of 3 MR. COOK: the deposition, line 15, (reading) "Question. If the APCo 4 test requires proof of an actual buyer of pole space 5 waiting in the wings, do you take issue with that 6 requirement. Mr. Estes -- same objection. 7 Witness answer -- again, that's difficult for me to interpret 8 9 as a valuation analyst in light of what I understand and know the accepted definition of fair market value 10 to be" (end reading). Did I read that correctly? 11 12 You read that correctly. Α Okay. In fact, it's your understanding in 13 0 this case, isn't it, that to the extent Gulf Power is 14 15 bringing this litigation trying to meet the Alabama relying only upon 16 Power requirements, it is hypothetical opportunities to lease pole space, right? 17 Objection, Your Honor. He's MR. ESTES: 18 asking Mr. Spain all the evidence that Gulf Power put 19 20 into this case? JUDGE SIPPEL: Sustained. 21 MR. COOK: I'm asking the witness for his 22

1	understanding of his of the party's claim that has
2	retained him. I think that's a entirely proper
3	question
4	MR. ESTES: Your Honor
5	MR. COOK: because this this witness
6	is an expert, and he's talking about his understanding
7	of the facts of his party's claim. He has taken issue
8	with what we believe is the governing legal standard,
9	Alabama Power, and said instead of burden of proving
10	loss
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait, wait, wait. This is
12	you're getting into yeah, you're getting into
13	things that I'm going to sustain the objection.
14	I'm going to say this to you. You have a right to ask
15	this witness what he relied upon in giving his
16	opinion. Okay? That's what you can ask him. I think
17	you've done that to a great degree.
18	MR. COOK: Okay.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: And with respect to the
20	hypothetical, I don't know how many ways, shapes and
21	forms you want to establish the fact that he looks
22	upon the buyer as being a hypothetical buyer. That is

1	not going to change.
2	MR. COOK: And and this this
3	question was only a slight variation, which is
4	essentially what has your client told you about what
5	they're relying on? Is ti just
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. No, no, no, no,
7	no, no. I keep telling you, you can ask this witness
8	what he relied on.
9	MR. COOK: Okay.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't care what the
11	client relied on.
12	MR. COOK: Okay.
13	BY MR. COOK:
14	Q Did you rely I'm sorry
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Ask him what he relied on.
16	BY MR. COOK:
17	Q Did you rely
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cook?
19	MR. COOK: Yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Ask him what he relied on.
21	MR. COOK: Okay.
22	BY MR. COOK:

1	Q What did you rely upon for any evidence of
2	loss?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: We want to know what he
4	relied upon for purposes of formulating his opinion,
5	and then you can narrow it down to loss. But let's
6	start with what he relied upon to formulate his
7	opinion. Okay?
8	MR. COOK: Okay. But I I have to ask
9	the court's indulgence. I'm confused when you say ask
10	him what he relied upon, you mean generally the entire
11	scope of everything?
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: He should be able to tick
13	it right off for your.
14	MR. COOK: Okay. I'd like to pose the
15	judge's question. What did you rely on.
16	THE WITNESS: That I've relied upon my
17	experience as a CPA, my experience as a CVA, the
18	industry research that I did that specifically relates
19	to utilities, my experience as a CPA with a dozen or
20	so or more years in the utilities industry, both
21	electric distribution, natural gas distribution, water
22	gustoms as well my experience as a CVA that relates

1	to valuing businesses and and all that that entails
2	and specific readings that I did in preparation for
3	this case.
4	BY MR. COOK:
5	Q And did you rely on any instance where an
6	actual buyer of pole space approached Gulf about an
7	opportunity to get up on its poles and Gulf was not
8	able to accommodate?
9	A I've not seen documents that relate to
10	that.
11	Q So the answer would be no?
12	A No then.
13	Q Okay. Now you also take issue in your
14	testimony with another requirement within Alabama
15	Power showing proof of a higher valued use within
16	Gulf's own operations. Is that correct?
17	A That's that's difficult for me to
18	interpret, again, as a valuation analyst.
19	Q Okay. So you when you say it's
20	difficult for you to interpret, you take issue with it
21	any requirement that Gulf be required to show a
22	higher valued use within its operations? Is that

1 right? 2 JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cook, it makes no 3 difference whether he takes issue with it. He's told 4 you -- he's told you that he has difficulty --5 MR. COOK: Okay. I'll move on. 6 BY MR. COOK: 7 At the -- you have never seen Gulf Power's Q 8 petition for reconsideration and request for 9 evidentiary hearing, have you? 10 Α I apologize if -- if I don't recall exactly which legal filings that I've looked at and 11 12 haven't, but I -- I think have looked at that but --13 Q Could I direct your attention to Okay. 14 Deposition Excerpts page 257, and within that to page 15 217, on line four, I say, (reading) "Okay. 16 show you a document which is called Gulf Power 17 Company's petition for reconsideration and request for 18 evidentiary hearing to the FCC dated June 23rd, 2003" 19 (end reading). Then there's (reading) "Mr. Cook, what 20 is this. Exhibit 10. The document referred to is 21 marked for identification as Spain Exhibit 10" (end 22 And I have a question and ask you to take reading).

1	a look at this first just to page through it and ask
2	you if you've ever seen this before. (Reading)
3	"Answer. Perusing document. I don't think I've seen
4	this" (end reading). Did I read that correctly?
5	A That's correct.
6	MR. ESTES: Your Honor, I'm going to
7	object. That is completely improper impeachment. The
8	question was have you ever seen the document. Mr.
9 9	Cook showed the document to him. I mean how's he
10	impeaching him by saying that he I mean he at
11	the deposition had not read it. Of course he's seen
12	it.
13	MR. COOK: Well, to answer to answer
14	Mr. Estes' comment, I wanted to ask that question by
15	saying at the time of your deposition, you had never
16	seen this, but I was afraid that Mr. Estes would jump
17	up and make an objection about that, so I I shied
18	away from saying at the time of your deposition and
19	asked it generally. But I think we've established
20	that point, so I'll move on.
21	BY MR. COOK:
22	O If if I may, at the time of your

1 deposition, you had not seen the hearing designation 2 order in this case, right? 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Does that really make a 4 difference? 5 Well, Your Honor, what I'm MR. COOK: 6 trying to establish here is that the expert witness that they have tendered to provide an opinion in this 7 8 case is not familiar with the issues as designated by 9 the Bureau. I think that's a very important point for 10 Your Honor, as the trier of fact, to understand. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not so sure as --12 you know, you don't want to turn the expert into a 13 lawyer that knows everything about the case. You want 14 an expert to testify to his narrow field of expertise. 15 And I don't know if he wasn't prepared at the 16 deposition the way you think he should have been 17 What difference does that make? prepared. 18 MR. COOK: Well, I think, as I just stated 19 a moment ago, this -- we're here to address a specific 20 issue as designated by the Bureau in the hearing 21 designation order. I wanted to get it across or -- or 22 to communicate and, again, respectfully to you as the

1	trier of fact that this expert witness doesn't know
2	what the issues set for designation are. Now that's
3	fine. We've established that again.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, no, no. Don't tell
5	me what we've established.
6	MR. COOK: Oh, I'm sorry.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's proposed findings.
8	Just ask the witness the question.
9	MR. COOK: Okay.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm having a problem with
11	the relevance. That's the problem is exactly what
12	difference does it make that he did or didn't see an
13	HDO at his deposition when we're trying to determine
14	whether or not he's qualified to give the opinion he's
15	given today today? All right? So, please
16	MR. COOK: Okay.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: stick with it.
18	BY MR. COOK:
19	Q You were not asked to analyze Gulf Power's
20	marginal costs in this case, right?
21	A No, I was asked to determine the
22	appropriate method for determining fair market value

1	of their pole space.
2	Q And you have no idea what Gulf Power's
3	marginal costs actually are for the four cable
4	operator complainants in this case, right?
5	A I've not done a calculation.
6	Q Okay. But you you actually said
7	previously you have no idea what the marginal costs of
8	the cable operators are
9	MR. ESTES: Your Honor, asked and
LO	answered.
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sustained. It's been asked
L2	and answered.
L3	BY MR. COOK:
L4	Q And you do not know what rates the cable
L5	operator complainants have paid to Gulf Power during
L6	the last several years, right?
L7	A I mean I I know the range. I think
L8	it's in the \$6.00 range or so.
L9	Q Okay. And this is the first case that you
20	worked on that has involved the FCC pole attachment
21	cable rate formula, right?
22	MR. ESTES: Your Honor, asked and

1	answered. He asked that about
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sustained.
3	MR. ESTES: twenty-five minutes ago.
4	BY MR. COOK:
5	Q You aren't able to say what the categories
6	in the FCC formula are for the carrying charge, right?
7	A I I think the carrying charge allocates
8	takes a look at plant, operating costs, and
9	administrative costs and and makes a determination
LO	as to to cost of the pole and the allocates the
L1	other costs that I just mentioned based on a space
L2	allocation factor.
L3	Q Okay. And you don't know the specific
.4	FERC accounts that the FCC has stated should be
L5	included in the pole rate carrying charge, do you?
L6	A I may get it wrong. I haven't necessarily
7	committed it to memory, but I think it may be 593 and
.8	then a few of the 900 series accounts, about 920 up
.9	through maybe 928 or so, and again, I would need to
20	refresh my memory by looking at the list and then
21	there are certain deferred tax accounts in the 408
22	series. They're included. And and the basis for

1	all of that is the plant numbers that are included in,
2	I believe, 364, 365, and 369
3	Q Could I draw your attention
4	A If I'm wrong, I apologize.
5	Q Could I draw your attention to
6	Complainants Deposition Excerpts page 259
7	A Okay.
8	Q where I said 259, and within that,
9	page 232
10	A Yes.
11	Q At 231, 232, (reading) "Question. Do you
12	know what electric utility FERC accounts go into the
13	FCC formula. Answer. That's what I was referring to
14	a moment ago. Specifically, I can't tell you exactly
15	which accounts correspond as I'm sitting here right
16	now to each of those expense items, but, you know,
17	they're somewhere in the 500's and probably a couple
18	in the 900's" (end reading). Did I read that
19	correctly?
20	A You did.
21	Q Okay.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what's the purpose

1	for that?
2	MR. COOK: Your Honor, again, I'm I'm -
3	_
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's
5	MR. COOK: trying to establish
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: he's
7	MR. COOK: what the witness does and
8	does not know.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: But if I'm hearing you
10	right, he said essentially the same thing today as he
11	said in his deposition on that point, essentially.
12	MR. COOK: I'll move right on.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, please don't take
14	this back to do it over again, please?
15	MR. COOK: Okay. I'm trying to to go
16	through by category, Your Honor, and I'm almost done.
17	Before we get to the testimony per se what the
18	witness' general knowledge and lack of knowledge
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please ask your next
20	MR. COOK: on all points
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cook, ask your next
22	question.

1	MR. COOK: Okay.
2	BY MR. COOK:
3	Q As of the time of your deposition, you had
4	not seen the FCC Commission's order of May 2001 in
5	Alabama Power, right?
6	A I think that's right.
7	Q Okay. Now I'd like to come back to your
8	statement in your report that you're trying to
9	determine the fair market value of Gulf's pole
LO	attachments. When you wrote your expert summary
11	report, which was March 3rd of this year, 2006, you
12	did not know that in paragraph 53 of the Commission's
13	Alabama Power May 2001 decision, it had concluded that
14	the valuation standards for determining fair market
L5	value are quote particularly unsuited for valuing pole
L6	attachments, did you?
L7	A I didn't know that that language existed
18	at the time that I did my report. However, I don't
L9	know that, and I've since read that, and I don't know
20	that it impacted the work that I did.
21	Q Okay. Now in your expert opinion, you
22	rely upon the notion of a fair market value standard

being based upon the prices that willing buyers and 1 2 sellers would agree to for pole attachments, right? I think that's right. 3 Α 4 0 But when you quoted the willing buyer, 5 willing seller standard in your expert summary report, you had not read the Commission's May 2001 Alabama 6 7 Power ruling in paragraph 55 where it said there are no arms lengths transactions reflecting the prices 8 9 paid by willing buyers and sellers for comparable pole 10 attachments, right? Whatever -- I hadn't read that at the 11 12 time, and whatever conclusion had been reached at that information went into 13 time. Ι don' know what concluding that. However, I'm -- I'm certainly done 14 my own analysis and -- and am prepared to offer the --15 the result of my analysis, and it speaks to that 16 But that was the court's finding, and -- and 17 I -- I don't know what went into that. 18 And you had not read, when you wrote your 19 0 20 report, the Commission's finding in paragraph 55 that there is quote no non monopoly market in pole 21 22 attachments, had you?

	A Again, I hadi t lead that, but and I
2	don't know what went into that, but since then, I have
3	read that and done some of my own research, and I'm
4	prepared to share that with you.
5	Q In fact, when I showed you at your
6	deposition the Commission's order, you said with
7	reference to the Commission's conclusion that
8	replacement costs are particularly unsuited for
9	valuing pole attachments, you said that appears to be
10	the opinion they're expressing here, but I don't know
11	that I agree with that, right?
12	A If that's what I said, then that's what I
13	said.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: If I'm hearing you
15	correctly, today you are prepared to explain further
16	as to what your what your professional reaction is
17	to what the Commission wrote?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, and and I'll
19	offer it to you now if you'd like to hear it, but,
20	yes, sir.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm I don't want
22	to interfere with his cross examination. I want him
l	

1	to be aware of what it is that you're prepared to
2	testify to. Maybe this would be coming out on direct.
3	MR. COOK: Your Honor, I have I have
4	one more question I know we're 15 minutes over
5	before it would be a good breaking point. I'm about
6	one-third of the way through my total cross
7	examination, so if I may, I'd ask one more question,
8	and then ask to pick up in the morning depending on
9	what Your Honor wants to do.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, ask your next
11	question and let's see where we are.
12	MR. COOK: Okay.
13	BY MR. COOK:
14	Q Mr. Spain, in this case, you were not
15	rendering an independent analysis or calculation.
16	Your only task was to analyze the appropriate method
17	for calculating fair market value of pole attachments,
18	right?
19	A My task was to determine the appropriate
20	method for determining fair market value of pole
21	attachments.
- 1	

1 independent analysis or calculation, right? 2 MR. ESTES: Objection, Your Honor, to the 3 extent he's characterizing whether his analysis was 4 independent that ornot is complete 5 characterization is not --I'm going to sustain the 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: 7 objection. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. ESTES: 9 MR. COOK: May I direct -- I certainly 10 would not want to put words in the witness' mouth. 11 May I direct you to Complainant's Deposition Excerpts 12 page 231, and within that, page 85 -- page 85, line 8, 13 (reading) "Okay. So is I it accurate to say in this 14 you're rendering an opinion about the 15 reasonableness of Gulf's Power's rate calculation, 16 you're not rendering an independent analysis as to the 17 value of Gulf's pole space. Answer. I'm not 18 rendering an independent analysis or calculation, and 19 my task was to analyze the appropriate method for 20 calculating fair market value of the pole attachment" 21 (end reading). Did I read that correctly?

Α

Yes.

1	MR. COOK: Okay. I think this is a a
2	good breaking point, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me go off the record.
4	(Whereupon, the matter went off the record
5	at 4:15 p.m. and back on the record at 4:19 p.m.)
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Back on the record. It's
7	been discussed with respect to scheduling. This
8	witness, Mr. Spain, will be on the stand tomorrow
9	morning at 9:00, and we will take matters up with
10	respect to the various motions with respect to the
11	the the relevance of testimony of experts, and we
12	would then be expecting to have your expert start in
13	the afternoon. That would be Ms
14	MR. COOK: Kravtin.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Kravtin. Okay. So, that
16	will be it. We're in recess until nine tomorrow
17	morning. Thank you very much.
18	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
19	adjourned at 4:19 p.m.)
20 21 22 23	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

FLORIDA CABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL.

Name of Hearing	
EB DOCKET NO. 04-381	L
Docket No. (if appl	icable)
445 12 th STREET, S.W	., WASHINGTON, D.C.
Place of Hearing	
APRIL 25, 2006	
Date of Hearing	
numbers 887 through complete transcript Charles Morratendance at the all applicable provision Commission's profess statement of Work and of the transcript by against the reporting and (2) comparing the comparing the complete comparing the complete complete comparing the complete c	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 1190, inclusive, are the true, accurate and prepared from the reporting by ison (Reporter's Name) in cove identified hearing, in accordance with me of the current Federal Communications sional verbatim reporting and transcription and have verified the accuracy of the accuracy (1) comparing the typewritten transcripting or recording accomplished at the hearings are final proofed typewritten transcripting or recording accomplished at the hearing or
May 5, 2006	Charles Morrison (Marke M)Cor
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Reporter Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.
May 5, 2006	Lucy Gudz
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.
May 5, 2006	Nora Thompson Nora Thompson
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Proofreader

Name of Company: __Neal Gross Co.____